

[*With the Author's compliments and
best wishes for the prosperity of
the Society.*]

AN

ADDRESS

DELIVERED IN

THE CRYSTAL PALACE

ON NOVEMBER 3, 1855,

BY

M. DIGBY WYATT,

AT THE OPENING OF AN EXHIBITION OF WORKS OF ART

BELONGING TO

THE ARUNDEL SOCIETY,

AND CONSISTING OF

TRACINGS AND DRAWINGS FROM PAINTINGS BY GIOTTO AND

OTHER EARLY ITALIAN ARTISTS,

WITH SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF GREEK SCULPTURE AND OF

ANCIENT IVORY-CARVING.

LONDON:

BELL AND DALDY, 186 FLEET STREET.

1855.



LONDON:
Printed by G. BARCLAY, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

AN
ADDRESS,

&c.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

As you are doubtless aware, the attempt to address any assembly in this building is as yet an untried experiment; and it is very doubtful how far it may be possible to make the voice audible without so straining it as to render its pitch painful and unpleasing. I should not have been led to hazard such an experiment now, had it not been found impossible to obtain the services of a gentleman, whose habitual eloquence would have done far more justice than I can hope to render to the theme which it is our object this day to consider. The Council of the Arundel Society had hoped that Mr. Ruskin would have been able to deliver this address; but as his numerous engagements at the present moment have frustrated their expectations, the duty has fallen upon the shoulders of one whom, I apprehend, you will find but an unworthy substitute for the brilliant author of the "Modern Painters."

It would have appeared to me better to leave Mr. Ruskin's place altogether unoccupied, had I not found by experience that on all occasions on which any subject having affinity to Archæology has been presented for general examination, unaccompanied by the observations of those who have made such subjects a special study, it has been invariably liable to misconstruction. This has doubtless arisen from our unreadiness to identify ourselves with the difficulties under which the artists of the past have laboured—difficulties which unless we can realise, we are almost certain to commit injustice towards men whom time has justly honoured.

The collection which is now brought together in the Arundel Court of the Crystal Palace consists of Monuments of Painting and of Sculpture; with a consideration of the former of which we shall proceed to commence.

The earliest as well as most important of these were executed by an artist of the name of Giotto di Bondone, who was born about the year 1276, according to Vasari, or about 1270 according to some of his commentators—a comparatively archaic period for art in Italy—nearly corresponding in English history with the advent to the throne

of Edward I., and with the time at which the Chapter House of Salisbury Cathedral was built. Giotto was the friend of Dante and of Petrarch, and was known and admired by Boccaccio, Sacchetti, Villani, and all the great Italian poets and writers of that period. Rarely, indeed, has there been an artist who so completely identified himself with the psychological and literary characteristics of his age. Of him Dante says, in a well-known passage,—

“Credette Cimabue nella pintura
Tener lo campo; ed ora ha Giotto il grido
Siche la fama di colui oscura.”*

In these words, Oderigi d'Agobbio, the celebrated illuminator, addresses the Florentine and Mantuan poets, drawing a parallel between his own position and that of Franco Bolognese, by whom he had been surpassed, and those of Cimabue and Giotto:—“You believe,” says he, “Cimabue to hold the field against all comers in painting, and to-day Giotto has all the public voice, so that the fame of the former is obscured.”

Petrarch boasts, in the fifth book of his “Familiar Letters,” that he had the honour of knowing two painters—“*egregios nec formosos*,”—one being Giotto, and the other Simone Memmi of Sienna; and so much did he value Giotto's works, that in his will he bequeathed to Francesco da Carrara, the podesta and chief magistrate of Padua, a painting by that artist of the Madonna, which, he says, “the ignorant will not appreciate, but to those learned in art it will be a matter of admiration.”† Again, Giovanni Villani, the historian, speaks of him as a man who was the first painter of all time. Lorenzo Ghiberti says that “he changed art from top to bottom, making that Latin which had been Greek.” Boccaccio declares that there was nothing human that he could not imitate; and Cennini confirms the testimony of Ghiberti in the same enthusiastic terms, and with especial reference to technical manipulation. His very tomb is graced by an elegant and eulogistic inscription from the pen of the learned Politian.

Now there must be something in these works of Giotto—representations of which are around us—or else all these great men must have made some fatal error of judgment.

The first step by which we may hope to test the accuracy of a verdict, against the justice of which no single voice has yet been raised, and to appreciate fairly what is in these works, must obviously be by realising to ourselves the position in which Giotto stood at the time in which they were executed. I cannot better paraphrase my impression of his relation to his age, than by thinking of this present gloomy day, and of the influence which a ray of sunlight would exercise, should such beam amongst us at this moment. Just such an influence was exerted by Giotto over the clouded state of art, at the time his great light dawned upon its horizon.

In order that you may appreciate what he introduced into the

* *Purgatorio*. Canto xi.

† “*Cujus pulchritudinem ignorantes non intelligunt, magistri autem artis stupent.*”

theory and practice of Art, and the completeness of the changes he effected, I will now run briefly over its leading characteristics previous to his time.

You will probably remember that the ordinary painting of the Catacombs was assimilated to that of the ancient Romans, with the difference that the subjects were almost exclusively Christian instead of Pagan, and that they were represented in a symbolical rather than a dramatic form. This was necessary, because, being obviously contrary to the faith of the ruling powers, it was not safe, in those days of persecution, to express openly the facts to which they bore testimony.

This symbolical mode of representation lasted from necessity, for the first three centuries in Italy, and subsisted from choice for several more. On the translation of the Empire, with all its pomp, and the majority of its leading workmen, to Greece, these transplanted artists and artificers preserved at Constantinople the practice and traditions of classic ages. Thus it was, that until the time of Justinian, (A.D. 527-565) the workmanship, both in the technical processes (principally of mosaic and the other modes of executing pictorial works) and also in design, was almost identical in the old and new countries. It was not till a period shortly preceding the time of the iconoclastic troubles, about A.D. 726, when it was considered that the Greeks were becoming too idolatrous in their representations, that any difference between the Latin or Western, and the Greek or Eastern styles, became manifest. Presently, when we come to the ivory carvings, I shall show how the divergence took place; but at all events, it was not till towards the end of the ninth century, when a reaction took place against the movement of destruction, that Greece created an independent system of types for the portrayal of Scripture history at all. It was then, that in the celebrated Menologion of the Emperor Basil, one of the capital MSS. of the Vatican Library, a complete series of illustrations was given to the world, both of Sacred History and of the Acts of the Martyrs. In them it is to be observed, that the sufferings of the Saints are depicted directly in the actual circumstances belonging to martyrdom; whereas, in the works of Latin origin, they are either represented in some symbolical manner, or altogether set aside, leaving only the aspirations, the triumphs, and glories of the Church upon record.

This art of Byzantium assumed, then, an entirely independent and individual character about the year 900; and as it became more completely developed towards the era of our Norman Conquest, it far outstripped all competitors, feeding the West with its inspirations and technicalities.

It is curious that a movement of independent organization appears to have taken place in the North; and dating from the middle of the sixth century, about the time when the early Irish Saints,—St. Columbanus, St. Columbkil, St. Kilian, St. Gall, St. Fridolin, and St. Fiacre, —went forth as missionaries to the other countries of Europe, and

propagated the faith from Ireland, a corresponding change certainly did take place abroad. It is most probably to the impetus thus given, that we may trace the origination of, what was generally called by ancient writers on art, the "German," as opposed to the Roman manner. It was begun by Irish and Anglo-Saxon missionaries to Germany, where, especially upon the banks of the Rhine, considerable remnants of the old Roman occupation existed. This mixture of Northern and Celtic with Latin Art made that conglomerate which eventually led to the Pointed Style.

Greek painters and Architects were, for a long while, almost exclusively employed in Italy; but as the year 1200 approached, there descended certain artists from the North, who effected a considerable modification upon what was practised previously to their time in that country. Thus, almost all the buildings in Italy, up to the year 1200, were constructed with round arches, and in that Byzantine or Romanesque style which has been illustrated in the Byzantine Court of the Crystal Palace. Soon after the year 1220, however, we find in the Church of Sant' Andrea, at Vercelli, built by a Frenchman, that a regular Gothic treatment is introduced; and at a later period, the Pointed Style was carried to a still more perfect development in the Church of San Francisco at Assisi, built by Magister Jacobus, who is supposed to have been in the service of the Emperor Frederic II. of Germany.

Now, this Church of St. Francis draws our attention also to several vital principles, which stimulated art into a more energetic existence at this time. It was built to commemorate the canonisation of St. Francis. You will remember that the Church obtained a powerful influence over the minds of men previous to the year 1000, sharing no doubt, and openly encouraging the popular belief, that in that year the end of all things was at hand. The greatest sinners of those days (and they were many and rich) gave their possessions to the Church, in order that they might propitiate the inflictor of the calamity, and, if possible, avert it. Abundantly provided as the Church was, through this means, with funds to carry out great works, the heart of the people was not lively stirred up to acts of devotion any longer than the pressure of imminent danger lasted; and, it appears, that for, at least, a hundred and fifty years after the year 1000, there was a general laxity of faith, both among laity and clergy—the obvious reaction from a previous state of terrorism in those who felt themselves relieved from the pressure of immediate peril. Theology at that time being almost entirely confined to the schoolmen, had but little affinity with, and could speak but indirectly to, the minds of the great mass of the population.

This creeping paralysis, in some degree fostered by the Ghibelline party, was beginning to sensibly affect the heart of Rome, when, fortunately for the existing Church, there arose two extraordinarily gifted men,—St. Dominic and St. Francis, who, themselves and their followers, became the media of translating the leading doctrines of the scholastic theology, which had been systematised by Albertus Magnus

and St. Thomas Aquinas, to the minds of the people—spiritualising their intelligence of doctrine, and, at the same time, bringing down that doctrine to the level of the popular comprehension. From this time forward two distinct modes of representing subjects of faith became prevalent,—that which had been imported from Byzantium by the Greeks, representing the legends of the old Eastern rather than the then existing Western Church—and that which was summoned into being to assist the advocates of the formulas of monastic theology, in procuring a more lively adhesion to the spiritual faith they taught. That is why, when the first Italian artists who possessed originality were urged by the Dominican or Franciscan monks to depict subjects either in painting or sculpture, a difference made itself at once perceptible between their productions and those which would have been given to the world had either the Byzantines done it, or the Italian artists themselves, working upon Latin traditions, independently of the influence of the propagators of the new views.

Great revolutions in faith rarely fail to evoke great poets, and the intellectual movement we have been attempting to describe found its first and noblest bard in Dante. In the “*Divina Commedia*” he realised those forms of suffering and beatitude which entranced the fervour of such saints as Francis of Assisi and Catherine of Sienna; while, at the same time, he effected an entire revolution in the Italian language, which he raised from a common dialect into a beautiful system of phraseology, calculated to give expression to the loftiest and most tender thoughts. A parallel revolution his friend, Giotto, effected in painting, altogether departing from the mannerism then in vogue; enriching it with new types, and creating forms more spiritual, and yet far more human, than any which had previously existed. At the same time we can scarcely assert with truth, that Giotto was the father of painting in Italy, since we know that many preceded him, and that paintings of a much earlier period than his exist in the Gallery of Sienna. One amongst them bears the inscription,—

“*Me Guido de Senis diebus depinxit amenis,
Quem Christus lenis nullis velit agere poenis,
Anno D.MCCXXI.*”

That is, “Guido of Sienna, on whom may God have mercy, painted me in the pleasant days of 1221.” Now Guido da Sienna, Margharitone d’Arezzo, and Giunta da Pisa—respectively of Sienna, Arezzo, and Pisa,—were the founders of the Greco-Italian school. These painters worked altogether after the manner of those Greek masters, whom we know to have been residing at Venice, Florence, Rome, and Pisa, and engaged in the execution of the mosaics of the churches in those places. There were also numerous Byzantine artists, who wandered about Italy, like Solsernus, who put up the great mosaic on the façade of the cathedral at Spoleto, about 1230; Couxolus, who painted in fresco at Subiaco; and Apollonius, the master of Andrea Tafi, who also worked in mosaic at Florence at the same period. These artists all wrought according to the rigid Greek system.

The researches of the industrious Von Rumohr have only brought to light the name of one artist, who was employed by the municipality of Florence previous to the time of Cimabue, and he may therefore be properly regarded as the founder of the new school in that city. He was born about 1230, and was the first of the Florentines who began to diverge from the manner of the Greek artists; he learnt from them, but differed from them. It is, however, as the master of Giotto that he becomes most interesting in our inquiry into the merits of the latter artist. When Cimabue was yet a young man, he executed for the Florentines a picture now in the gallery of the Uffizii at Florence; and in that may be seen how closely he imitated the Greeks in his youth: they, as you are doubtless aware, worked principally in mosaic. Now, in order to adapt a pictorial subject for successful execution through this medium, it was necessary to break up all broad surfaces into little parts, so that the mortar lines should not become too conspicuous, and disturb that aspect of perfect technical manipulation to which the Greeks mainly aspired. The designs in their sketch-books, their studies, their manuscripts, were all drawn over with the lines fit for a mosaic rendering duly inserted. When artists began to paint in other media,—in tempera and fresco,—they still retained the mosaic outlines and cartoons which formed their stock in trade. Thus the system of breaking the draperies into little folds was preserved, and in the first paintings of Cimabue you see the whole of the garments of our Saviour and the Virgin are treated in that style. At a later period in life he painted a second picture—that celebrated one which was carried in grand procession from the house he lived in at Florence, in the “borgo” he had rendered so “allegro,” to the church of Sta. Maria Novella, in which it is now preserved. You will probably remember Mr. Leighton’s interesting picture of this great festa, which was so conspicuous an object in the last exhibition of the Royal Academy, and which was honoured by being purchased for Her Majesty. On the whole, the arrangement of Cimabue’s second Holy Family is exactly that which is common to all the Greek artists of the time; but in carrying it out he effected several very great improvements, especially in drawing the folds of the drapery more simply and broadly, avoiding the Byzantine practice of “*tratteggiando*,” or hatching them all into little pleats; putting more clear and lively colours into the costumes, representing the Virgin as more plump and youthful, and changing the colour of the flesh to more natural tints than that greenish hue which prevailed under the Greeks.

At the risk of repeating a far more than “thrice-told tale,” I would remind you of the celebrated story how Cimabue found Giotto drawing a sheep on the roadside, on the way from Florence to Bologna;—he, Giotto, being the son of a common labourer, and his genius having manifested itself by seizing every opportunity he could meet with for portraying whatever met his vision, or affected his youthful imagination. Cimabue was so pleased with the talent which the boy displayed that he took him to Florence with him, and brought him up as his

pupil. Cimabue was a kind master to him in all respects, and helped him to emancipate himself from the thralldom of Greek tradition, against which Cimabue rather protested than absolutely rebelled. One of the last-named artist's chief works was at Assisi, where the church of San Francisco had been very recently built. He there executed the noble paintings on the vaulting of the Upper Church, of one compartment of which there is a very successful copy in the Byzantine Court, and the ornaments of which are almost of a classical character. He is also supposed to have begun a series of very important works on the walls of the same church.

It is probable that Giotto may have assisted his master in the execution of these works; but as soon as he was free to paint on his own account, he was employed to execute several compositions representing the history of St. Francis, and the Life and Acts of the Virgin and Our Saviour, in the various churches of Florence. In these works he showed himself a no less dexterous artist than original thinker; and in this last capacity he gave a new aspect to his paintings differing from all that had gone before him. At a later period of his life he revisited Assisi, where he completed the works of his master in a beautiful series of paintings. It was in that great sanctuary of the Franciscans that he most fully showed how deeply his communings with Dante—whose portrait he had already painted at Florence—had entered into his being. In the vault over the tomb of St. Francis he painted a series of four compartments, representing subjects illustrating the nature of the theological persuasion of St. Francis; he showed the virtues to which the Franciscan order vowed itself; and, as principal subject, he drew St. Francis marrying Poverty—a vivid and graceful embodiment of which incident, describing the manner in which the Saint tenderly loved Poverty, chose her as his spouse, and won her through every difficulty, you will probably remember is one of the most beautiful passages Dante ever wrote.

About the year 1306 Giotto went to Padua, where he found that a certain knight of the name of Enrico Scrovegno had become possessed of the old Arena, which was the building in which the games of the ancients had been celebrated at Padua. This piece of property, which was something in form like the Colosseum, but much smaller, had been granted by Henry the Third, Emperor of Germany, to the family of the Delesmanini, by whom it was converted into a fortress. They becoming poor, sold it to Reginaldo Scrovegno (stigmatised by Dante for his avarice), who was the father of the Enrico who built the chapel to the Virgin, with the design for which it seems highly probable that Giotto furnished him.

In this Arena, after the manner of the games with which the provincial prefects, and consuls of Imperial Rome had gratified the people, the clerks of later ages had instituted a kind of dramatic representation, somewhat like the old mysteries in England, realising scenes of a Scriptural nature in a very coarse, but, at the same time, a very popular fashion. On the accession of Enrico Scrovegno to this property, it

has been supposed, that not wishing to debar the people from their association with the mysteries of the Life and Passion of Our Saviour, he thought it more decorous to build, or possibly to rebuild a chapel in that place, in which the worship of the Madonna more particularly could be carried on, and in which the great incidents of the working out of human salvation might be brought under the eyes of the faithful at all times.

Some writers, such as Federici and Selvatico, have considered that this Enrico Scrovegno was one of the knights of that order called originally "Cavalieri di Sta. Maria," and subsequently, on account of their luxurious and dissolute living, "frati godenti." Incident to that state of laxity in the Church to which I have alluded, doubts had taken root in the popular mind, not only respecting the sanctity of the office of men, some of whose lives had furnished the groundwork for such scandalous novels as those of Boccaccio and Bandello, but more particularly affecting the divinity of the Saviour, and even the existence of the Virgin Mary. To repress such scepticism,—perhaps, also, to assist the Guelphic party against the aggressions of the Ghibelline,—an order of knights had been established whose avowed first duty it was to seize every occasion of exalting the divinity and office of the Virgin Mary; and whose second, and, probably, principal employment, was advancing the interests of the papal and ecclesiastical party. There are several details in this chapel of the Arena to justify this supposition; the most convincing, probably, being the fact, that the principal bearing in the arms of the Scrovegni—the "scrofa azzurra," or blue sow, alluded to by Dante in his description of his meeting with Reginald Scrovegno in hell, was represented in the chapel in conjunction with the sign of the cross, the symbol of the order of the Cavalieri. From that and other circumstances, there seems, I think, little doubt that this Enrico Scrovegno was one of the knights of this order, and that he built his chapel in honour of the Annunciate Virgin, thereby carrying out the precepts of the confraternity to which he belonged. Assuming this, it was natural that the subjects he selected for painting on the walls should have been chosen from the life of the Virgin, which he has taken care to illustrate only by incidents in her own life, but in those of her parents, and in that of Our Saviour.

I have here a clever little tracing, showing the general aspect of the chapel, as it appears at present in the centre of the Arena, in the flat space formed by the accumulation of the soil in its interior. *This* (referring to plan) shows the general quadrangular form of the chapel; and you will see that the building is a long parallelogram, with a chancel which extends from the east end.

The Court in which we now stand has been arranged as far as possible to represent the chapel. *Here* (describing) is supposed to be the east end of the nave, and these its north and south walls. These latter are entirely covered with frescoes, divided by bands of coloured ornaments, of which an interesting series of drawings by Signor Allegri are exhibited with the tracings. The ceiling is a tender

blue, ornamented with gold stars. In circular compartments are painted heads of Our Saviour, and the Virgin, surrounded by Evangelists and Prophets in smaller circles; thus, in the semi-cylindrical vault, an attempt has been made to represent the firmament of heaven, and beneath, upon the walls, have been arranged pictures of the acts which, although truly heavenly in their associations, took place upon earth.

It may make us feel better enabled to enter into what was done by Giotto, if, before we proceed farther, we examine the portrait of that great man, which is one of the most interesting specimens of physiognomy Time has handed down to us. We are not quite positive that this is his portrait; but we may believe it is, not only because tradition has constantly stated that it was in the particular part of a particular fresco from which this tracing has been made, that he painted himself; but because it coincides exactly with those characteristics with which Boccaccio has invested him—such as, that although by no means beautiful, he was most witty and ready in reply. I should keep you too long if I were to tell you all the jokes that are recorded of Giotto; but you will see that his expression in this portrait is full of life and fun. In it you may trace almost every quality an artist's head should have,—except beauty. A fine intellectual forehead,—rather a pert, lively, imaginative nose,—a flexible mouth,—refined in the upper lip,—sensual in the lower,—and a chin with an expression of will to do great things, even in despite of still greater obstacles.

As befitted the friend of Dante, Giotto has treated the incidents in the Life of the Virgin, embracing the circumstances of the Passion of our Lord, with a fine imagination and great sweetness. Respecting those affecting the father and mother of the Blessed Virgin, we must look to those accounts which the magnates of the Church provided for the people who demanded in those days material details concerning those interesting circumstances. The principal of such accounts are what are known as the two apocryphal Gospels—the Protevangelion, and the Gospel of St. Mary, together with another very interesting Italian MS., discovered by Mr. Ruskin in the British Museum, which records the “History of the Holy Family.” In these books, the veracity of a quantity of minute legendary detail, making up a complete dramatic story, was endorsed by the scholastic historians.

If you will just look with me at these tracings from the frescoes which have been actually made upon the walls of the Chapel, you will see how full and interesting these stories were made.

In the first of the series, you recognise Joachim, who was the father of the Blessed Virgin. He was rich,—well-to-do,—with flocks and herds,—but unfortunately childless, though he had been long married. When already advanced in years, he made an offering to the Divine Power, possibly in order that he might be blessed with offspring. In this drawing, No. 1, he is shown in the Temple with his offering, which was rejected by the High Priest, who told him he was

a man unworthy to present himself in the Temple since God had signified his displeasure with him by not blessing him with heirs of his body.

In the second picture, he is returning to his sheep-fold, altogether disconsolate.

In the third scene, his wife is shown praying,—probably for the accomplishment of the same wish which had filled her husband's mind; but her senses are aroused by the descent of an angel, who brings her the glad tidings that his offering, although rejected by the High Priest, has been accepted by One higher than him, and that their mutual wishes shall be gratified. This is an interesting subject, because it contains a better treatment of perspective than had ever been made before. It also illustrates another leading feature in Giotto's works, which is, that he was content to accept natural types, and illustrate the diviner parts of his subjects by seeking motives from the groups and circumstances which he saw around him. In this instance he has represented the servant-maid sitting and working, just as naturally as he had, no doubt, seen them in the houses of Florence.

In No. 4, Joachim makes another offering, though this time in the wilderness, his attention is concentrated on the consumption by fire of his offering. There is a beautiful expression of faith and veneration in the head and attitude of Joachim in that fresco.

In the next fresco, No. 5, he is shown as receiving a direct answer to the prayers and sacrifices he had made, and bowing down at an intimation from an angel who comes to him in the field, telling him that his wife was likely to have a child, and bidding him go to the city where she then was.

The next subject, No. 6, is one of the most beautiful of the series. In it we recognise St. Anna coming to the gate to meet her husband, and falling upon his neck. This is one of the earliest representations of tender modesty, and fitly inaugurates the next subject—the birth of that Virgin, who brought love and reconciliation into the world.

No. 7. Here we have the birth of the Virgin, with St. Anna holding out her arms to receive her.

In No. 8, we observe the Presentation of the Virgin. This is an incident which is traditionally considered to have taken place when the Virgin was only three years old. Giotto had not yet arrived at the art which he considered essential to sustain the appearance of dignity proper to the Virgin Mary, and at the same time to ally it with such tender childhood. He has, therefore, drawn her as almost a young woman, and he has in this way endeavoured to retain the beauty and grace he felt to be inseparable from her character.

In No. 9, the Virgin is supposed to have arrived at a marriageable age, and the tradition relates that the High Priest ordered that her husband should be selected from among the young men of the tribe to which she belonged. The choice among her suitors, it was declared, should be determined after each of these young men had

presented a rod to him,—the Virgin Mary should be given in marriage to that one amongst them whose rod should bud, and upon the head of which a dove should alight. In this subject the rods are brought to the High Priest.

In the next compartment, No. 10, the rods are supposed to be placed on the altar, and the suitors, kneeling, pray that the miracle may take place.

In No. 11, the Virgin is betrothed to Joseph, who is shown with a rod that has budded, and upon which a dove has settled. He is shown in the act of putting the ring upon the Virgin's finger, while the other suitors appear to be indignant with him for having won her as his bride.

In No. 12, the Virgin returns to her home amidst her companions.

In No. 13 and 14, are represented the Annunciation; and that is one of the most beautiful subjects among the series. The grace and solemnity with which the angel announces the glad tidings, feeling them to be of the very utmost importance to human salvation, is beautifully expressed; and so are the modesty, awe and yet dignity, with which the Virgin receives the announcement.

No. 15 is the Visitation,—St. Mary is received by Elizabeth, each being attended by her handmaids.

In No. 16, we begin the events of the life of our Saviour. On the right stand the Shepherds, while the remainder of the fresco depicts the Nativity. There is one feature to be recognised in that tracing which is very beautiful,—the tenderness of the Virgin towards the child, and the sweetness with which she turns round to lay it in the manger, being admirably expressed, and certainly conveying emotions, the importance of rendering which naturally had assuredly never entered into the heads of the artists who immediately preceded Giotto.

No. 17 is the Worship of the Magi.

No. 18, the Presentation of Christ in the Temple.

No. 19, the Flight into Egypt, is also very beautiful. Although more in accordance with the Greek type than any of the others, it is very much elevated in treatment and made much more beautiful than its prototype.

No. 20, the Massacre of the Innocents, perhaps, falls a little below the rest of the series, and yet it is exceedingly interesting, because it affords a curious comparison with one of the most celebrated pieces of sculpture of the time. Giovanni Pisano tells the story better, and has made, I think, both a more interesting and more energetic representation of it in his pulpit at St. Andrea at Pistoia than Giotto has done here.

No. 21, Christ Teaching in the Temple, speaks for itself. It displays very nice treatment.

No. 22, the Baptism of Christ, is again according to the Byzantine arrangement; there is something like it in the ivories of the period.

No. 23, the Marriage in Cana, is both clever and amusing. It shows the humorous side of Giotto's character, in the drawing of the jolly-looking, portly gentleman who is drinking out of the cup on the right hand of the picture;—very likely a caricature of some civic dignitary of Padua.

In No. 24, we come, I think, to perhaps the most impressive of all the series. It is one of the most sublime renderings of the Raising of Lazarus that has ever been conceived,—exceeding in dignity, to my taste, the celebrated picture of Sebastian del Piombo in the National Gallery. The intense curiosity with which one of the bystanders looks into the face of the dead-alive man—the shrinking with which another covers his mouth from proximity to the corpse—the impassive dignity of our Saviour, and the earnestness of those kneeling figures, tell the story most dramatically. This is an exceedingly interesting and very ancient subject, because from the earliest period the Church looked upon the raising of Lazarus as the emblem of the Resurrection, and when the first Christians did not dare to represent the latter, they symbolised it by the former.

No. 25 is the Entry into Jerusalem, the architecture of which is very interesting.

No. 26 is the Expulsion of the Money Changers. This is generally considered to be more vulgar than any of the rest of the series, from the inability of Giotto to cope with violent action. Art had not then realised the conditions of the foreshortening of the figure, and Giotto could not put it in proper relation with the laws of gravity, nor did he know how to express violent action by changes in muscular development. He has, therefore, somewhat failed in such subjects; but it is almost as interesting, though by no means so profitable, to trace the points in which he has been found inadequate, as it is to notice those in which he has exceeded all who had preceded him.

No. 27, the Hiring of Judas. Giotto was the first person to express individualities of physiognomy and emotion. Many of the latter verge upon caricature, but great allowance must be made for the first daring spirit who essayed to represent what had never previously been attempted. In several of these subjects we find crying figures, with their muscles all drawn up, and with none of that softening down of the action of weeping, which has since become conventional. He wanted to express the fact as strongly as he felt it, and it was his great master quality of *feeling intensely* that gave him such strength to surpass all his rivals and contemporaries.

No. 28, the Last Supper, is not quite equal to the rest of the series.

No. 29, Washing the Disciples' Feet, is a very beautiful subject. There are two figures of young men,—one of them holding a water-can,—which are of peculiar merit, and are, doubtless, drawn with much spirit from life.

No. 30, the Kiss of Judas, is the next; the contrast between the

head of the Saviour and that of his betrayer being admirably expressed.

No. 31 is Christ before Caiaphas, and then comes,

No. 32, the Flagellation. This has always been a difficult subject to represent, because the artists were unwilling to represent in any ordinary manner the horrid nature of those who could commit an act so utterly repugnant to their faith; so that in the representations of the subject in the thirteenth century, either the action of the soldiers becomes almost inanimate, or they are caricatured almost as demons.

No. 33, Christ bearing the Cross, is very beautiful.

No. 34 is the Crucifixion, and No. 35, the Entombment. The latter is one of the grandest of the series; because in examining it you must remember that the Greeks, up to the time of Giotto, had always represented the Saviour in the most emaciated and miserable manner. It had been a doctrine of some of the fathers of the Greek Church that the Saviour was remarkable for the uncomeliness of his appearance, and it was only some of the Latin theologians who opposed this, and represented him as beautiful in his form. Giotto has abandoned the Greek type, and, instead of representing the body as squalid and emaciated, he has made its form, though thin, perfectly graceful and refined in its outline. The intensity of the expression of the Virgin, of "the other Mary," and the Magdalene, and the beautiful repose in the head of the Saviour, are altogether very remarkable. I am happy in being able to direct your attention to this picture of the subject, which shows the beautiful colouring peculiar to Giotto. The copy before you was drawn by Signor Belloli for the Society.

No. 36 is the Resurrection,—and it is one that Italian critics have generally regarded as the finest of the series,—testing its merits by the length of time it took for succeeding artists to overtake the power Giotto has displayed in the figure of the Angel seated, and in the beautiful action of the Saviour as he says, "Noli me tangere." Altogether this subject has never been better imagined, though, of course, in the hands of Raffaello, it may have been better delineated.

No. 37 is the Ascension. Here, again, I am happy, by the kindness of Mr. Rogers, its possessor, to be able to show you a coloured copy of the original by Mr. Williams, the gentleman by whom all the tracings have been made. The blue has faded in the original, as compared with this drawing, but when first painted, I have little doubt, the whole of the colours were as strong as these. One great quality to be appreciated in these works of Giotto is, that the improvements which he effected in form were almost exceeded by the improvements he effected in colour. In the works of Cimabue everything is dark and heavy,—brown, green and dead, as in the Greek painting, although he improved much upon that. Giotto was the first painter who appreciated *white* and tenderness of colour. To this, which I regard as one of the greatest improvements he effected, Mr. Ruskin has added others, especially citing his feeling for breadth and sobriety of tone. He appreciated, in the highest degree, the art of making

the wall look flat, and obtaining just relief enough in his figures for them to appear as if they were modelled in very low relief upon it—and then very tenderly coloured,—without letting the eye go through the wall, as is the custom in the later frescoes. His manner of painting fulfils almost all the conditions of convention which are demanded from the successful *mural* decorator. Now, I need not dwell upon the beauty of this treatment of the Ascension in No. 37, for it is self-evident. There is, however, one feature which is very peculiar, and that is the circumstance of all the figures holding their hands before their eyes to avert the splendour of the light.

The last subject, No. 38, is the Descent of the Holy Ghost, which forms a worthy climax to the whole. There is not one common head among all the Apostles,—you cannot look at any one of them and say, “That is a common man;”—would that as much could be said for many a modern treatment of the same grand theme!

Besides this series, which occupies the upper part of the walls, we have representations beneath them by Giotto, of the Cardinal Virtues and Vices,—copies of which are here before you. These were among the favourite early theological subjects; such spiritual renderings, through emblematical representations, concurring with the teaching of the scholastic school, and of the active orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis. They represented to the minds of the common people the qualities which they could scarcely appreciate otherwise, under those material forms their minds could best grasp; and these allegorical types were sanctioned by the practice of the middle ages throughout Europe.

Now that I have examined, however hurriedly, these important illustrations of the works of Giotto, I feel sure that you will not go away from here, and report that there is nothing in them, which you might very possibly have done, unless you had heard some few particulars about the difficulties he overcame, and the manifold improvements he effected in his art.

We now leap over a considerable period of time. The paintings by Giotto we have been examining were of about the year 1306, and we now turn to about the year 1447 (about 140 years after Giotto),—when a certain monk of the order of St. Dominic lived at Fiesole and Florence. He was a most pious man, and devoted his thoughts and his time to painting sacred subjects, covering the cells and corridors of the convents in which he resided with his beautiful representations of them. The frescoes by this artist here represented, were painted (in the chapel of San Lorenzo, in the Vatican,) either for Pope Eugenius IV., or more probably for Pope Nicholas V. who succeeded him.

This chapel is a quadrangular apartment, covered with plain quadripartite vaulting, and in the vault are painted the four Evangelists, larger than life. On three of the walls beneath, are depicted subjects relating to the early deacons, St. Stephen and St. Lawrence; and on the wall by which you enter, there are painted the four Doctors

of the Greek Church, St. John Chrysostom, St. Leo, St. Athanasius, and St. Gregory; and the four Doctors of the Latin Church,—St. Thomas, St. Bonaventura, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine.

The principal paintings, of which copies are here, are from the series devoted to St. Lawrence. There are five of these,—the series beginning with St. Lawrence receiving his diaconal investiture from Pope Sixtus II. In another scene he is receiving money from the Pope, which in a third he is shown distributing to the poor;—in the fourth of the set he is summoned before the Prefect Decius, to give an account of his faith and conduct: and here it would be wrong to omit drawing attention to the heavenly grace and dignity of the figure of St. Lawrence in this picture. Ultimately we have his martyrdom in the year 258. There is a somewhat parallel series of incidents selected from the Life of St. Stephen the protomartyr; and among these there are some very beautiful drawings.

There is yet another artist to notice, before I complete the series of illustrations of the history of painting,—collected by the energies of the Arundel Society,—in the person of Domenico Ghirlandajo, the master of Michael Angelo, who painted in the year 1485 a series of frescoes at Florence in the church of the Trinità, showing the chief incidents in the life of St. Francis. Amongst these the fresco of which Signor Rapisardi has made the copy now exhibited, representing the death of the Saint, is perhaps the most interesting, as showing how far the sentiment displayed in the works of Giotto may be united to a more perfect mode of artistic representation. Ghirlandajo was one of those celebrated artists who began life as a goldsmith, in which branch of art, while a youth, he made those celebrated garlands in such great demand among the ladies of Florence in the latter part of the fifteenth century.

Having now concluded, as far as the exertions of the Arundel Society have hitherto extended, the subject of painting, we approach another branch of art scarcely less interesting,—namely, the illustrations of *Sculpture*.

All who have hitherto attempted to trace the history of Sculpture in Italy in the earlier ages chronologically, have found that a very great lapse, or hiatus, has existed in the sequence of illustrations of the art. This comparative hiatus, which lasted from the decline of the Roman Empire till the commencement of Gothic art, exists as an almost total blank; and if the Lombards, between the years 600 and 800, had not left us some evidence of what was going on in Sculpture in Italy, we should, but for objects of cabinet dimension, really possess no important authentic records of what was being done in that country for at least 400 years. Now the reason of this hiatus is, that the buildings in which works of sculpture were contained have for the most part been destroyed; and all objects worked in the precious metals melted down and converted into money;—works in Ivory, however,

having no intrinsic value, have been preserved to us, and it is only in the objects now before you that we can hope to find those illustrations of the dark ages which do not exist in any other material at all. Surely it is, therefore, a most laudable occupation of some portion of the Arundel Society's funds, to give casts of these great curiosities to the world at little more than cost price. The light which has been thrown upon the history of Art by their collection in the first instance by Mr. Augustus Franks, Mr. Alexander Nesbitt, and Mr. Westwood, the accomplished author of the "*Palæographia Sacra*," and their admirable chronological arrangement by Mr. Oldfield of the British Museum, is inestimable.

The earliest specimens date from a comparatively good period of Imperial Rome. There are here a pair of casts, which are faithfully reproduced from ivory leaves, which were once joined together with hinges on the longest side, so as to shut up in the form of a tall ledger, or upright memorandum-book. The exterior faces of such covers were invariably covered with carving, and the internal faces generally covered with wax, upon which, with a pointed instrument, the Romans wrote their memorandums. The ivory book so made up possibly belonged to some emperor or noble of the time of the Antonines. Upon the outside are represented—on one leaf Æsculapius and Telesphorus, and upon the other Hygieia. Judging from the subjects, very possibly these may have been the memorandum-book of the principal doctor of Rome, and may have been carried about by him to record the order of his daily visits. There are other specimens of the same kind among the collection which the Arundel Society have brought under your notice, and among the most interesting, is perhaps one which is thought to represent the Emperor Philip, the Arab, presiding at the Secular Games in the circus, which took place A.D. 248. Now it was the custom of the Roman Emperors and Patricians, to make presents of these ivories and memorandum-books upon occasions of great private festivities or public rejoicings; and the Latin poet, Martial, in one of his books which he calls the "*Apophoreta*," consisting of a series of little distichs, has described somewhat in detail the gifts ordinarily given by the founder of a feast to his guests. Among them he specially notices wooden and ivory note-books, drawing the following distinction between them:—The wooden ones he supposes to have been covered on the inside with wax, and so speaks of them;—but of the ivory ones he says, "Your weak eyes shall not be troubled with reading on the dull wax, but the white ivory shall be painted for you with black letters." * Such are the earliest remains of ivory carvings which have come down to us, of those which appear to have been used in the Imperial times of Rome; but towards the year 400 their character almost entirely changed. The Consulship became altogether

* "*Languida ne tristes obscurant lumina cerae
Nigra tibi niveum litera pingat ebur.*"

associated with the Imperial office; it became the custom of the Consuls, upon their appointment, to present to their equals and even to their subordinate officers money in purses, and ivory diptychs similar to the memorandum-books used under the earlier Emperors. On one side of such books the Consul himself is generally represented, and above his head his name is engraved.

As dates were at that period recorded by the Consular fasti, it has been supposed that on the inside the names of the different Consuls who had preceded the one represented were inscribed so that the series might terminate with the name of the existing Consul. One of these being sent abroad to the foreign Prefects at every change in the Consular office, it served as the official register for the measurement of time;—such at least is M. Pulzsky's ingenious theory. Such diptychs were not used before the year 400, nor in the Western Empire after the year 480. The earliest dates from about A.D. 400, and is that of the Consul Fermus. It is preserved in the cathedral at Aosta in Italy. The second is represented in this collection, and is that of the Consul Flavius, a rude specimen of Latin work. There are some here which are exceedingly interesting, as showing the difference between those of the Latin and Greek empires. In those of the Western Empire (see the diptych of Flavius), the Consul is represented standing; in the Eastern (see that of Clementinus) he is shown seated in the curule chair. After a while these Consular diptychs fell into disuse for their original purpose,—the habit of counting time by the change of Consuls having been abandoned; and we are, in consequence, led to trace a curious instance of the desire for the retention of some of the outward symbols of Pagan authority in the early Christian Church.

This is a Christian ivory diptych, which resembles the Roman ones in all respects, with the single exception that the subject is a Christian angel, with a cross above it. It is apparently of about the time of Constantine; it is preserved in the British Museum, and is one of the most curious and finest ivories in the world. On the inside of these no Consuls' names were inscribed,—in fact they were for the most part made after Consuls were abolished; but in their stead it was the custom to write the names of benefactors to the church, living in one book, dead in another, as well as those of bishops and of the principal nobles and others possessing the Church's patronage and immunities. On one of these which is described by Gori, and which is now preserved in the Museum at Berlin, are still to be read faintly the names of the different principal people who belonged to the church in which that diptych was kept, and upon the altar of which it was exposed. Many Consular diptychs were converted into Christian ones, by cutting out the Consul's name and substituting for it that of some Saint—(see the Monza diptychs of King David and St. Gregory).

We have hitherto spoken principally of Latin diptychs executed in Italy, but in the East also an important movement was going on; and at the time of Justinian, A.D. 527-563, a considerable manifes-

tation of artistic talent was shown. After the time of Justinian this power fell away, and it was not, as we have already stated, until after the recovery from the iconoclastic troubles that life again came into Greek art. Its highest period is that of the mosaic work of the church of St. Clemente at Rome, about the year of our Conquest, and contemporary with that we find a beautiful class of Greek ivory carvings. *This* of the Emperor Romanus IV., and of the Empress Eudocia, A.D. 1068,* has all the best attributes of Byzantine art, possessing a greater degree of dignity and *beauty* than we can ever trace at any after period of Greek art. The small folds of the drapery,—the lengthened proportion of the figures,—the richly jewelled dresses, are so many distinguishing marks of the school and of the period.

In the Situla Class VI. *e.* we have an illustration of that particular Lombard influence which I spoke of before as coming from the North. It was an ivory bucket used by Archbishop Godfrey to administer holy water to the Emperor Otho on the occasion of his visit to Milan, between the years 973 and 978. It is preserved in the cathedral at Milan, and its authenticity is undoubted.

This casket from the cathedral of Sens is a monument of Greek art, and is exceedingly curious. It is a most complete specimen of ivory-carving, executed about the year 1050.

I am only able to select a very few of these specimens: to those who are disposed to study the subject at all in detail, this collection offers an almost infinite variety of historical and artistic information.

This is an illustration of an important class of ivory-carvings which succeeded the diptychs. It is a book-cover. The Mediæval and Byzantine book-writers were, as you know, in the habit of illuminating their writings in the most elaborate and beautiful manner; and they thought it right that the covers should be not less noble than the books within them. This is an illustration of the Byzantine ivory book-covers; and, in spite of its richness, it shows the ordinary faults of the Greek school, possessing neither drawing, design, nor any merit at all, except in the fact that it exhibits considerable technical dexterity at a time when spirit and taste were wanting.

Now I have spoken of the influence that descended from the North to Italy at the time of Giotto. That was assisted by the great development of art under Charlemagne, who having fixed the seat of his empire at Aix-la-Chapelle, brought together there artists from every country, mosaic workers especially, comparatively unknown in the North, from Constantinople. From that city, as well as from Rome, he imported vast numbers of works of art, and, amongst his most sumptuous possessions, were a pair of ivory doors executed in the most delicate style at the former of those cities. The specimen here exhibited,† constitutes a curious illustration of the art of his time, both in the architecture and the figures.

Now all these seeds, no doubt, took root in Aix-la-Chapelle, and

* The cast Class VII. G. was here exhibited.

† The cast Class V. g. was here shown.

fructifying in a soil which had been prepared for their reception by the decayed traditions of Roman art which had spread over the district from the ancient Roman colony of Cologne, produced a style of art of which you will find specimens in the Byzantine Court in the doors of Archbishop Bernhard from Hildesheim, and from Augsburg. All the doors in bronze, from various places in the North (and in Russia particularly), were brought into being through the engrafting of this German art of Charlemagne's time upon the crabbed stock of local Scandinavian dexterity.

Our subject now becomes specially interesting, because we approach the school and time of Giovanni Pisano, the great Christian sculptor, who immediately preceded, and was yet contemporary with, Giotto. Giotto, who, I should have told you, in addition to being a great painter, was an architect and a sculptor, and the designer of the Campanile in Florence as well, no doubt, learnt much from Giovanni. The former arranged the whole scheme of the external decoration of that noble monument, probably in conjunction with Dante. In this design he represented, successively rising from the bottom to the top of the structure, the seven simplest occupations of domestic life, the seven liberal arts, the seven sciences, the seven cardinal virtues, the seven Schoolmen, the spiritual influences in the form of angels and prophets, and so up through all the different relations into which the schoolmen had divided the whole hierarchy of heaven, and probably, if it had been carried to the full extent of his intentions, it would have been crowned by a statue of the Divinity himself. *This* ivory represented the baptism of Christ, and it agrees with the design of Giotto, though it is rather more coarsely expressed.

The Italian works of this period differ from those of France, Germany, and England, in being carved upon separate pieces of bone instead of ivory. The southern specimens are in African or Asiatic ivory, while most of the northern carvings of that time are of the tooth of the walrus. All the Scandinavian chessmen which are seen in British and Continental Museums are in that material. The southern chessmen, on the other hand, of which there are some in the Museum at Paris, are of African ivory, and carved quite differently from the northern specimens.

In the Middle Ages generally there was a small imitation, for private use, of the diptychs placed upon the altar, and in these, no doubt, were either reliques or certain passages of Scripture. They were placed upon the temporary altars in private oratories, and were common throughout Europe. They were generally carved with subjects from the Gospels, and many beautiful examples of them are to be found, especially during the thirteenth century, coeval with Nicola Pisano, and the sculptures of Wells Cathedral, &c. At a later time, in the fourteenth century, the art was carried into general subjects, and its productions applied to manifold uses. Thus we find caskets, note-books, and mirror-cases in abundance, richly decorated with subjects from the domestic life of the period,—ladies with their falcons on their fists, knights and ladies playing chess, &c.; others

are enriched with graphic designs from the story of the Morte d'Arthur, the Lai d'Aristote, &c.—the assault of the Château d'Amour being one of the greatest favourites among them all. These latter themes were generally appropriated to the outsides of caskets or to the decoration of mirror-cases.

In addition to the books we have spoken of, there were so-called *triptychs* in the church, or carvings consisting of three tablets; one fixed part and two side-leaves, which were shut up when they were not required to stimulate devotion, but were spread out when the owners were praying before the altar.

It is very singular that the name of only one ivory-carver of mediæval times has come down to us. He was a certain Jean Le-braillier, employed by Charles V. of France, and his name is mentioned in an inventory of the king's treasures.

However elegant many of the fifteenth and sixteenth century Italian carvings were, the life and spirit of the Gothic specimens are wanting, and softness takes the place of crispness. The artists of the French Renaissance have, however, left us some admirable illustrations of their dexterity in carving small objects, such as combs, &c.

It has not been the object of the Arundel Society to carry this collection into recent or modern times; but it would not be right to omit telling you, that the art was carried to great perfection in the times of the later artists of Italy. Ivory carving was much patronised by the Grand Dukes of Tuscany especially, and in Florence there is still a large collection of ivories of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The revival passed from thence to Saxony and Bavaria, the Electors of Saxony having some of them been actual artificers in such works; and from thence came that infinity of goblets mounted with gold and silver, and beautiful little plaques, covered over with mythological and Bacchanalian subjects, which extend down to quite modern times. One of the best specimens of ivory drinking vessels is the celebrated cup by Magnus Berger (a Swede), exhibited by Her Majesty at the Mediæval Exhibition of the Society of Arts.

Now this is all that has been comprised in the Arundel Society's intentions with regard to ivory-carving; but they have made another effort, and a very interesting one, to illustrate the art of sculpture. They availed themselves of the ingenious mechanical process of Mr. Cheverton for the reduction of two of the most celebrated monuments of Greek art, the "Theseus and the Ilissus," which, as you know, are figures from the two pediments of the Parthenon; and I can only say, that, by Mr. Cheverton's process, these have been reproduced microscopically, and almost magically. There is also one slab of the frieze of the Parthenon reduced in the same way, the whole having been executed so as to bring down faultless models of the very best class of works of art to the level of the pockets of the great majority among us.

I have used the term *they* so often, that I daresay you may be

anxious to know something about *them*. "They"—meaning the Arundel Society—consist of a body of amateurs, formed in the year 1849, to prosecute the investigation and record of those monuments of art which were not likely to be made known to the public through any other influence than their own. To carry out these views they formed themselves into a society, whose affairs are conducted by a Council of from 10 to 15 gentlemen elected at the annual general meeting of the Subscribers, and under their superintendence the Society has constantly employed artists on the Continent, to obtain these tracings and to make the drawings from which they have published excellent engravings. They have moreover, fortunately enlisted the co-operation of some other gentlemen of great zeal and ability—particularly Mr. Nesbitt, Mr. Westwood, and Mr. Franks of the British Museum, by whom, as I have already stated, the collection of gutta-percha impressions of these ivories has been made; from these gentlemen's impressions, the Council have had types made, and then again they have had moulds from those, so that they are now able to supply casts to all who may desire to have them at little more than cost price, and I can only hope, for the interests of Art, that they will find a very wide market for their wares.

I cannot conclude without expressing my earnest hope that you will not carry away the impression that studies of an archæological nature and the carrying out of objects such as this Society has attempted, are without their practical importance in this generation. Any glass-painter, or wall-painter, or any artists occupied with sculpture in any material, must gain a great deal from a study of these frescoes and ivories. They will, in the first place, see how important it is to endeavour to stamp their works with a legitimate connexion with each other, and to give them that dramatic interest which is indispensable to command the emotions of the beholder. A single picture, separated and isolated, cannot, of course, represent a course of action, or take cognizance of circumstances which may have preceded or followed the moment selected for representation; but, in a series, that connexion of incident can be indicated which converts Art from a lyric into an epic, and gives it an all-powerful and moving influence over the popular mind.

Again, any artist who will study these works will find that, whenever the simple expression of any natural emotion, or any tender sensation, has been honestly carried out, everybody must be struck with the power of it, and will be ready to overlook almost any amount of technical imperfection. Further, they give us an interesting illustration of a very difficult practical question, which is every day presenting itself, namely: How far it may be possible to unite with truth and sentiment a just sufficient amount of archaism in form to connect itself, without jarring upon our senses, with the mediæval style which, in modern works of that character, we are bound to preserve and carry out? They show us, that a mode of mural decoration may be used which shall express all needful qualities of thought and feeling,

and shall yet assimilate, by its peculiar angularities, to an early style of architecture, without shocking the feelings by any gross want of drawing, or absence of human emotion and character. A very little addition, by way of correction, to the design of these frescoes, is quite as much as the eye can desire, which wants rather to see the subject of the picture and the thought of the painter, than to ascertain whether the work is well executed mechanically, and with what amount of dexterity. It is not by attempting, on all occasions, to put Raffaele where Raffaele ought not to be, that we can obtain those effects which neither Raffaele nor Giotto ever aimed at without realising.

Mr. YATES, at the close of the lecture, proposed the thanks of the audience to Mr. WYATT for the very interesting and learned remarks which he had made. At the same time, he would express the universal feeling of thankfulness and congratulation to the ARUNDEL SOCIETY, and to the gentlemen whose names had been mentioned by Mr. Wyatt (including Mr. OLDFIELD and Mr. ROGERS) for all the Society had done with so much success in promoting a knowledge of art. It was a further pleasure to him to express the thanks of the meeting to the DIRECTORS of the Crystal Palace for allowing them the opportunity of seeing the drawings now before them to so much advantage. In the Crimean Court of the Crystal Palace, among the relics of the sufferers on the fields of Alma, Inkermann, and Balaclava, some curious specimens of triptychs, as now worn by the Russian soldiers for charms, might be seen; together with curious specimens of religious paintings as now practised; and these were not bad illustrations of the art of painting in the Greek Church in the Middle Ages. In the Crystal Palace every variety of architecture and sculpture, from the rudest to the most perfect, was illustrated; but to bring the Crystal Palace to its culminating point as a means of instruction, such lectures as they had just heard were most desirable. It would be impossible to find any gentleman in Europe so well qualified, by learning and judgment, to do justice to a subject like the present, as Mr. Digby Wyatt, and he felt sure the meeting would unanimously vote him their best thanks. (Cheers.)

Mr. WYATT returned thanks, and stated, that the Arundel Society had made arrangements to allow the collection to remain some time in the Crystal Palace for exhibition.